The Address-Mr. Whelan

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ny social services in this country. They are not control them adequately. They point to West Germany and such countries as that as omic masterminds of industry and trade, but The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. At one o'clock the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) had the floor, and he has ten minutes remaining.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned for lunch I was talking about the economy of the country, the future of Canada, unity, etc. I should like to continue for a moment on that.

The recent by-elections were of interest, of course, but I was appalled to hear some of the things said, especially about the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau). When I spoke with some of the opposing candidates, I said, "You know what has been said is not true. Why do you not tell them it is not true?" They more or less walked around that question. They did not want to become involved in long debates. It put me in mind of the time of Christ. One of his apostles, Peter, went to Pontius Pilate and said, "What has this man done which is wrong? How has he sinned, this man called Christ?" Pontius Pilate said, "I can find no way he has done any wrong or no way that he has sinned. But they want him, so let him be crucified". I do not propose, as a member of the government, to allow that to happen. I would rather be an honest, defeated politician. Opposition members cannot say that the Prime Minister has done anything wrong at any time.

I have pointed out some of the economic philosophies to which so-called learned people in this country are referring. I have pointed out that they are bad. I was in Washington some weeks ago at a food symposium on nutrition, on feeding the world, food policy and strategy, etc. I have been quoted since then respecting what I said about jobs. At that time I was speaking in the same context as today, about how well we take care of unfortunate people who are unemployed, disabled, retired, and who cannot be in the earning sector of our society. I pointed out similar things as those pointed out by the hon. member for Halifax several months ago when he referred to the good old days being from 1946 on, when social services looked after those people. I said that it was not the same when I worked and earned 55 cents an hour for 80 hours a week, with no unemployment insurance or social benefits. That was the type of comparison which I was making. There is no country in the world which treats those people I am referring to any better than we do in Canada. Great issue was made of that.

Also great issue was made of the fact that I said the breakfast we received was lousy, when I spoke about nutrition. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) made great play about that. He went so far as to indicate that we were liable to break off diplomatic relations because of such a statement. Editorial writers from coast to coast also made comments about it. How could they write without being there, knowing what I said and knowing what kind of a symposium it was? I have been associated with these people for years. I was not invited by the American government. I was invited by a group of people, plus a public service broadcasting

maintains that he has created everything that is good, or at least his party does, but some people in Canada are saying that there are too many social services in this country. They are saying that we do not control them adequately. They point to people in Japan, West Germany and such countries as that as being great economic masterminds of industry and trade, but both those countries have social services which can be compared with those in Canada. Let us not deny that.

Some people say that this Minister of Agriculture is not very sympathetic with people who are jobless. I am in this House of Commons because I was once in municipal politics, although in not nearly as big a way as some hon. members. However, when I was in municipal politics, I was guided by and had to abide by the same municipal laws. In 1962 the mayor in my area was not opposed at election time because of the federal and provincial grants the Ford Motor Company received. Spending taxpayers' money made it possible for the Ford Motor Company to come to Canada instead of Michigan or Ohio where the same kinds of concessions were being offered. They are in an economic boom and it is not because of a lack of spending.

On a local radio station the other day I heard the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) say that he would not get involved in anything like that. Some hard talking was required in order to get my cabinet colleagues to conclude that we should get involved in things like that, as long as things like that exist in that great country to the south of us. Other economic giants such as Brazil, Japan and West Germany make tremendous concessions and, if we are going to compete in the world market, we will have to do the same.

Someone suggested earlier that perhaps we should not be competitive. Would the hon. member for York-Simcoe, who displays an economic pygmy attitude, rather see us spend money on unemployment insurance? Two thirds of the money put into the construction of the plant, to which I referred, by the federal and Ontario governments, will come back in taxes before the plant turns a wheel. There will also be taxes on steel and other commodities.

The figures I saw while consideration was being given to this matter did not include the tremendous amount of earnings construction people will have. Last night at the airport in Toronto I met someone from the construction industry, and he told me that the industry locally could not supply the Windsor area and that some components will have to come from many other parts of Canada. This development will not benefit only the area I represent but also many other areas of Canada.

I once studied to be a tool and die engineer, but I never completed my studies. Some might wish I had. They might think I would not be here if I had. However, one can hardly find a tool and die shop in my area which can take on any new work before 18 months or two years. They are booked solid. Mr. Speaker, may I call it one o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.